

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**BRITTNEY MILLS,**

*Plaintiff,*

v.

**CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, et al.,**

*Defendants.*

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CIVIL ACTION  
No. 14-593**

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this **22nd day of March 2024**, upon consideration of Defendant City of Philadelphia’s (the “City”) Motion to Preclude the Testimony and Report of Plaintiff’s Expert Shaun T. Santos (ECF No. 70), Plaintiff’s Response (ECF No. 76), the City’s Reply (ECF No. 87), as well as the City’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 68), Plaintiff’s Opposition (ECF No. 95), and Defendant’s Reply (ECF No. 100), it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The City’s Motion to Preclude (ECF No. 70) is **DENIED in part and GRANTED in part**. It is **DENIED** as to Santos’s proffered testimony and opinions relating to the inadequacy of internal affairs investigations and the City’s protection of the NFU contained within paragraphs 334–94 of his report. However, it is **GRANTED** as to the rest.
2. The City’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 68) is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**. It is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff’s negligent hiring, retention, and supervision claim (Count XV), as well as to the failure to train theory under Plaintiff’s municipal liability claim (Count XIV). It is **DENIED** as to the rest.

**BY THE COURT:**

**/s/ Chad F. Kenney**

---

**CHAD F. KENNEY, JUDGE**